

★

UMASS/AMHERST

★



312066 0270 3671 5

Dept. of Education.

GOVERNMENT

MENTS

C.

NC

University

Massachusetts

THE MASSACHUSETTS RIGHT TO READ EFFORT

U OF MASSACHUSETTS LIBRARY



YEAR 4

EVALUATION

1976 - 1977

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS
COLLECTION

NOV 10 1977

University of Massachusetts

TDR ASSOCIATES, INC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS	2
A. Impact of Right to Read Directors on their School Systems	2
B. Impact of the 1976-77 Training	12
C. Other 1976-77 Activities	14
III. STAGES OF INNOVATION: AN ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK FOR THE EVALUATION	19
IV. INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	21
APPENDIX A	26
Right to Read Director Interview and Tallied Responses	
APPENDIX B	32
Training Questionnaires and Tallied Responses	
APPENDIX C	44
Copley Conference Questionnaire and Tallied Responses	
APPENDIX D	50
Lenox Conference Questionnaire and Tallied Responses	

I. INTRODUCTION

This evaluation was conducted by TDR Associates, Inc. of Newton, Massachusetts, under contract with the Massachusetts Right to Read Effort. The primary focus of the evaluation is on the impact of veteran and current Right to Read Directors in their school systems, and the impact of this year's training. The impact on school systems was assessed through telephone interviews with a random sample of twenty-four Massachusetts Right to Read Directors. The impact of this year's training was assessed by questionnaires given three times in the training sequence. Secondary emphasis is given to the other activities of the Right to Read Effort, such as committees, publications, school system visits and dissemination. In these areas the evaluator examined project documentation and interviewed the key people involved in those activities.

The evaluation findings are discussed in section two, with references to the detailed data collected shown in the appendices. In section three, the findings are placed within a framework of stages of innovation, to facilitate understanding. In section four, the final section, interpretation of the findings and recommendations for future action are made.

II. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

A. Impact of Right to Read Directors on Their School Systems

INTRODUCTION

A sample of twenty-four people listed as Right to Read Directors was drawn randomly from a membership roster, representing seventy-two towns and cities participating in Right to Read from 1974-77. Twenty-one of these people were interviewed by telephone in May, 1977. The sample included eight people from 1974-75, eight from 1975-76, and eight from 1976-77. Of these, two from 1974-75 and one from 1975-76 were inactive to the point that they chose not to be interviewed. The remaining sample of twenty-one people interviewed consists of six from 1974-75, seven from 1975-76, and eight from 1976-77.

The purpose of the interviews was to gauge the level of accomplishment of Right to Read Directors in organizing improved language arts activities, and to identify factors that support or work against their accomplishments. The interviews each took about thirty minutes, and the questions used are shown on page 26. The responses are tallied and shown on pages 27-31.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

The twenty-one participants in the Right to Read Effort interviewed by TDR are an articulate, well-informed group of educators. They are hard-working, in most cases overworked, often important people in their school systems. Of the sample of twenty-one, eighteen are Right to Read Directors, two expect to be this fall, and one is an elementary school principal who attended some Right to Read sessions.

The majority of the sample (48 per cent) are directors of reading; six are K-12 directors, four are K-6. The next largest group (29 per cent) are remedial teachers: one high school, one K-12, and four elementary. Two elementary principals, one director of curriculum, one reading resource teacher, and one fifth grade teacher complete the group.

LEVEL OF RIGHT TO READ ACTIVITY

We asked each person interviewed to estimate his/her school system's Right to Read related activity level by year. Over half (52 per cent) currently do not consider themselves serious participants in the Right to Read Effort. All thirteen of the directors interviewed in the 1974-75 and 1975-76 groups felt that their first year, while they were in training and, for the most part, doing the needs assessment, had been active. In the second year six directors said Right to Read in their systems had begun to flounder. In their third year two more saw it come to a standstill.

Why in the present year are five of thirteen school systems following up the needs assessment while eight are not? Five of the directors cited lack of funds for staff, programs, and released time. Five spoke of a significant loss of communication with and direction from Right to Read. Three were given increased work loads which made them unable to function effectively as directors. Several cited lack of support in the town, and one referred to the indifference of high school teachers (a problem raised frequently in response to other questions). One director and her superintendent felt that students in their town simply did not have serious reading problems.

In the sample three directors from 1974-75 (50 per cent), and two from 1975-76 (29 per cent) have been steadily active in Right to Read. In

discussing their success, three mentioned the support given them by regional groups of Right to Read Directors who meet regularly. All alluded, directly or indirectly, to their own ability to work with teachers, gain their confidence, and get programs moving. Four spoke of supportive school systems; the fifth had less support and placed special emphasis on careful choice of the Right to Read Director, so that he / she would be a person strong enough to overcome an indifferent administration.

In our sample of eight people from 1976-77, this year's training group, two directors reported themselves to be at a high activity level, which they attributed to administrative and town support; and, in one case, to an exceptionally intelligent and committed staff. Three directors were moderately active, supported by their administrations and working mainly with the needs assessment, but uncertain of future directions. (One did not know if she would be a Right to Read Director next year; one felt unsure of herself in the role.)

Three members of the 1976-77 group saw themselves as making little or no progress. They were largely - in one case entirely - unsupported by their school systems. In addition, one was a new teacher, and one had had a serious illness during the year. Still, as all those interviewed from 1974-76 had some sense of accomplishment at least for their first year, the fact that only two out of eight directors in 1976-77 were highly active (25 per cent), three were moderately active (38 per cent), and three were inactive (38 per cent) is worth pondering.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

When asked to name their major accomplishments, most of the sample

cited several; 48 per cent spoke of work with teachers and gaining their confidence, showing the needs assessment was a help rather than a threat, and developing in-service training. Cooperation was usually with elementary teachers; high school teachers, unused to working with reading in content areas, resisted. Some (23 per cent) succeeded in involving the town, making it recognize the need for literacy; one system reported the development of an excellent training for its school volunteers including workshops on making and using teaching materials. Four directors (19 per cent) cited the completion of the needs assessment; three (14 per cent) referred to the formulation of a plan of action as their major accomplishment. Two (10 per cent) of the directors felt that their contribution to a regional group of Right to Read directors was important.

Five in the sample (23 per cent) had no significant accomplishments to report. Three of these, already discussed, were in the 1976-77 training, one was the director in the town "without serious reading problems." The last, Right to Read's most severe critic in the sample, felt that the training had been little help after the needs assessment, and that Right to Read had failed to give her school system adequate direction.

Administrative support ranked first (38 per cent) as a contributing factor in accomplishment. Teacher support (33 per cent) and community support (19 per cent) followed. Two cited their own ability to work with teachers; many others probably should have.

DISAPPOINTMENTS

In designing a question on major disappointments, we intended to separate causes and effects. In fact, they merged; disappointments were almost always broad failures of response rather than specific losses. Reluctance of teachers/

community/administration (usually more than one was involved) actively to support Right to Read came first (33 per cent), and lack of time to do justice to it (19 per cent) came next, both really reflections of lack of administrative or town support. Loss of contact with Right to Read was mentioned by two (10 per cent) and inability to deal with adult illiteracy, for which they blamed lack of Right to Read in the field, by another two. Four directors (19 per cent) reported no major disappointments.

TRAINING

Whatever their experience in implementing Right to Read in their own school systems, the great majority (86 per cent) of Right to Read Directors valued their training. Only three people in the sample felt it had been of little or no assistance to them. Most of those interviewed (81 per cent) praised the technical preparation for doing a needs assessment, writing proposals, organizing volunteers, and acting as a change agent. The Right to Read staff and individual speakers were singled out as being especially helpful by 48 per cent of the sample. Materials and information (29 per cent) and sessions after training (14 per cent) were mentioned. A large percentage (47 per cent) felt that they had gained as much from getting to know other Right to Read Directors and from learning about other school systems, as from the formal training.

The most consistent criticism of Right to Read training (48 per cent) was directed toward some of the outside speakers at the workshops, and the disorganized structure of particular sessions. The choice of speakers and subject matter were criticised by 29 per cent for being unsophisticated and underestimating the participants' expertise. But some teachers (10 per cent) felt the training was too difficult and theoretical, too much like graduate

school, and wanted more practical advice. These two seemingly opposed groups of critics tended to merge in their recommendations for the future of Right to Read, which will be discussed shortly.

Other criticisms were leveled at the quantity of reports and paper-work (14 per cent), the long traveling distance to attend the workshops (14 per cent), and unclear deadlines for applying for funds (10 per cent).

One third of those interviewed felt that Right to Read could have helped them to have greater impact by providing something tangible to show teachers and administrators in the form of money, materials, or concrete programming. Many mentioned that teachers are presently flooded with programs and need to be convinced of the immediate usefulness of Right to Read. Some (23 per cent) said that they wanted more support generally in working with their own school systems. Others (10 per cent) felt that more local and statewide publicity for Right to Read would give them greater credibility at home. "Better, more practical training" was what 19 per cent wanted from Right to Read; 29 per cent were completely satisfied.

SCHOOL SYSTEM CONTRIBUTIONS

While a substantial part of the sample (43 per cent) felt their school systems had done all they could for the Right to Read Effort, the rest were critical. One third wanted more released time for teachers and a reduced work load for themselves. Those wanting a more serious commitment to follow through on needs assessment, and fewer delays in granting requests totalled 29 percent. Eight directors (38 per cent) mentioned a need for more money or staff; two (10 per cent) felt more teachers and administrators in their system should take Right to Read training. (At other times during

interviews, directors made positive mention of principals who attended workshops with them.)

INTERVIEWEES' RECOMMENDATIONS

Our last question asked for future recommendations to the staff of the Massachusetts Right to Read Effort. This produced the fullest replies, probably because the person interviewed by then had had time to think through his or her experience with Right to Read. Though 14 percent had no suggestions, most had many. The largest number (38 per cent) expressed a desire to get more out of the training and asked that the staff organize sessions more carefully, be more selective about speakers, and make deadlines clearer. The feeling that the staff underestimated the group's sophistication was again emphasized.

Fewer speakers of any sort were preferred, and more exchange among participants in the training was favored by 23 per cent. The staff, they felt, should facilitate members' becoming acquainted and sharing experiences. They wanted the staff to further regional contacts and plan visits among participating school systems.

One third of the group felt Right to Read ought to pay more attention to the problems of individual school systems. They suggested assessing the needs of the group earlier, and following through by discussion of specific school systems' issues or by offering options in workshops.

Statewide and local publicity and public relations were again mentioned, and a substantial number (29 per cent) again raised the need for something concrete to show teachers, administration, and community. On-site visits from the Right to Read staff, materials, and teacher workshops were all

proposed to help give Right to Read direction after the completion of the needs assessment.

ISSUES

The most serious issue facing the Massachusetts Right to Read Effort is the falling off of interest and enthusiasm after the completion of the needs assessment. How could more than 50 per cent of the sample who have become inactive have been kept at a level of at least moderate activity?

Nearly all of the participants interviewed felt that they had benefited personally from Right to Read training. The association with other educators, the professional skill of the Right to Read staff, the technical preparation were valuable and stimulating. With this support, and with what most rated as excellent instruction in doing a needs assessment, most of these Right to Read Directors emerged from the first year with a sense of purpose and a clear idea of what their school system lacked.

Why was effective action on the needs assessment so difficult? For more than half the sample, the school system failed to provide necessary funding, staff, released time, or prompt action on requests. Several directors who made strong starts were brought to a halt in their second or third year when the administration increased their work loads, taking away time previously set aside for Right to Read. Conversely, strong administrative support was cited by 38 per cent as the key factor in their success.

However, a number of directors who were supported, or at least not

obstructed by their administrations, still failed to progress after the first year. One problem frequently encountered was the resistance of the high school teachers to working with reading in content areas, and it is again fortunate that this will be a focus for Year Five. We guess that there are several separate problems here - the high school teachers' own insecurity about teaching reading and writing and, in many cases, their mistrust of a Right to Read Director who is usually an elementary remedial teacher or reading director whom they hardly know.

Another specific issue mentioned by a much smaller part of the sample was adult illiteracy. The directors who mentioned it felt that Right to Read only paid lip service to working with it, and had provided neither training nor materials to meet what emerged as one of their system's real problems.

Even if directors do not encounter resistance on specific problems, many directors have a hard time. Some move ahead, planning workshops, organizing teacher task forces, and recruiting volunteers. Others are at a loss. The thrust of almost all the advice they offered Right to Read is to make the training in some way more practical, so that directors will be able to carry on when the first supportive year of training is over. The desire for more money, materials, visits, and specific programs to show teachers and administration is also a desire for more specific direction for themselves. So is the request for more time to discuss the problems of their individual school systems with staff and representatives from other LEA's during training and afterwards.

Nearly everyone in the sample valued the contact with other Right to

Read Directors, whose ideas they found more useful than "the experts'." The participants would like to see the expertise of members of their group used more in the training. They also want Right to Read to further regional groupings which would insure the continuance of these contacts. At least three of the seven most successful directors interviewed, belong to active regional groups. More publicity, elsewhere suggested as a means of convincing administration and community, could also be helpful in encouraging exchange with other systems.

A last area for Massachusetts Right to Read Effort to consider is the choice of a Right to Read Director. Seven of the systems whose representatives we interviewed are running highly active programs. In one case, we talked to an elementary principal who had taken some Right to Read training but was not a Right to Read Director. The other six were directors including three reading coordinators K-12, one coordinator of reading and special needs K-12, a director of curriculum K-12,,and an elementary principal. Except for the principals, the directors worked regularly with the whole system; all were people of obvious standing and authority; all had considerable experience in working with reading prior to joining Right to Read. They contrasted clearly with the people who did not like being Right to Read Directors. These people are usually reported as being less important in their school systems. While they enjoyed the training, they found their role either personally uncongenial because they were shy, or unexpectedly burdensome because neither they nor their administration anticipated the volume of work involved.

B. Impact of the 1976-77 Training

The 1976-77 Right to Read trainees were given three questionnaires during their sequence of training meetings. These questionnaires are comprehensive in that they include all major training topics covered. The questionnaires, and the tallied responses, are shown in Appendix B (pages 32 - 43).

As can be seen in the questionnaire response format, shown in Appendix B, the trainees were asked to rate their skills and understandings on the training topics "before Right to Read," and "because of Right to Read." The difference in "before" and "because of" ratings is used here as an index of the impact of the training on specific topics. As seen in Figure 1, (page 13), the average (mean) differences are positive (gains in skills and understandings) for all topics.

The gains of skills and understandings attributed to the training varied from 2.6 scale points (on a 5 point scale) to .3 scale points. Given the small numbers of respondents to each questionnaire (7-13 of 16 trainees), statistical analysis of the gains was not performed. However, most of the gains are impressive in relation to similar questionnaire responses analyzed by the evaluation.

Among the top six rated topics (see Figure 1, page 13) skills and understandings related to designing and conducting a local needs assessment appears in three (50 per cent) of the six topics. The lowest rated topic concerns the "components of a successful in-service training program," and the related topic "conducting staff development" is also rated low (eleventh of fourteen topic ratings). Also rated low are several language arts content topics, such as decoding (thirteenth of fourteen ratings), specific and global readiness (tenth of fourteen ratings), and current

FIGURE 1: Rank Order Ratings of Gains on Training Topics

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Gain</u>	<u>"Before"- "Because of"</u> <u>Ratings</u>	<u>Training Topics</u>
1	2.6	(1.9-4.5)	Conducting reading needs assessment for school system
2	2.1	(1.8-3.9)	Setting up a local advisory council
3	2.0	(1.9-3.9)	Understanding benefits and responsibilities of participating in Right to Read
4	1.7	(3.1-4.8)	Developing administrative support
5	1.6	(2.2-3.8)	Arranging for valid administration of needs assessment instrument
5	1.6	(2.2-3.8)	Identifying and describing comprehensive plan of action
6	1.5	(2.5-4.0)	Writing items for needs assessment instrument
6	1.5	(2.8-4.3)	Understanding several different ways of evaluating a reading program
7	1.3	(2.1-3.4)	Gaining cooperation of groups in Right to Read activities
7	1.3	(3.0-4.3)	Understanding new developments in reading comprehension research
7	1.3	(2.6-3.9)	Understanding concept of continuous progress in reading
8	1.1	(2.6-3.7)	Finding and training volunteers to be tutors
9	1.0	(2.4-3.4)	Teaching task force members or others to write items for needs assessment instrument
9	1.0	(2.6-3.6)	Understanding the steps to be taken as a change agent
9	1.0	(2.4-3.4)	Setting up local in-house task force and defining its tasks
10	.8	(2.1-2.9)	Understanding difference between specific and global readiness
11	.6	(2.9-3.5)	Conducting staff development in several different ways
11	.6	(2.0-2.6)	Writing a federal proposal
12	.5	(2.9-3.4)	Being familiar with current research on language acquisition and beginning reading instruction
13	.4	(4.0-4.4)	Understanding decoding in teaching reading
14	.3	(3.1-3.4)	Understanding components of successful in-service training program

research on reading (twelfth of fourteen ratings). Reading comprehension research and continuous progress in reading were given moderate ratings (seventh of fourteen ratings). Rated high to moderate were setting up a local advisory council (second), Right to Read benefits and responsibilities (third), developing administrator support (fourth), and gaining group cooperation (seventh).

C. Other 1976-77 Activities

As explained in the Introduction, the primary focus of the evaluation is on the impact of present and veteran Right to Read Directors on their school systems, and on the impact of the 1976-77 training. Secondary emphasis is given to the other 1976-77 activities, as reported in this section, based on an examination of project documentation, and interviews with key people. Thus, less data was collected for these areas than for the impact on school systems and training. The other 1976-77 Right to Read activities are: state needs assessment, criteria of excellence, the statewide advisory council, state education agency task force, dissemination, technical assistance, certification, and identification of exemplary and validated reading programs within the state.

STATE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The Massachusetts Right to Read Director participated in subcommittee work regarding the state assessment program, sponsored by the Bureau of Research and Assessment of the Massachusetts Department of Education. He focused on the assessment in reading and writing, helping with design, interpretation and explanation of the results to audiences in the state. He quoted

findings from the assessment in his grant proposals, and has referred to them in conferences to underscore the need for improvement in language arts in Massachusetts. Particular emphasis has been given to the poorer scores of high school students, underscoring the need for language arts instruction in the content areas such as social studies and science.

CRITERIA OF EXCELLENCE

The booklet, "The Focus on Excellence," written in a previous year under the aegis of the late New England consortium, has been used in Massachusetts as a criterion of excellence in Right to Read sites. It has also been used as a basis for local needs assessment. It has been the basis of a position paper, "Fostering Reading Interests," disseminated throughout the Commonwealth. The Right to Read staff anticipates that such position papers will stimulate discussion of issues and approaches in language arts teaching and learning.

STATEWIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL

The principal focus of the Statewide Advisory Council this year was on problems of low student reading comprehension at the secondary school levels. With the assistance of guest speakers, they came to view this problem in the context of social trends, and trends within commercial interests in the language arts. Divided into three subgroups, the Council is preparing a position paper regarding the responsibilities of students, teachers and parents in improving reading comprehension. It is anticipated that this position paper will be used to stimulate discussion and action in this problem area.

The Council is made up of non-paid lay people, many of whom are concerned about the erosion of basic skills, and how it affects their job areas or professions. They are enthusiastic about their work, and would like to have wide impact in the Commonwealth through public recognition of problems. They

are uncertain about the best strategy for producing such an impact, and feel somewhat ham-strung by what they see as a necessary filtering of their ideas in publications that have to be approved by the Massachusetts Department of Education. They also feel that the lack of teacher membership on the Council is a drawback in their work.

STATE EDUCATION AGENCY TASK FORCE

The Task Force appears to the evaluator to be fraught with problems. Several purposes are attached to the Task Force, each of which would require more meeting time than the Task Force has been able to realize. For example, included among its aims are: to develop Right to Read principles, to sell the Right to Read concept, to coordinate several different people in the regions of reading efforts in diverse areas such as special education and occupational education, and to react to periodic reports of the progress of the Right to Read Effort. Given the time and meeting constraints of the Task Force, its selection of a limited focus seems essential to its efficacy.

DISSEMINATION

The Right to Read Effort has disseminated several handbooks, papers, and other publications throughout the Commonwealth. The Right to Read staff and Advisory Council Chairman were involved in approximately one-hundred speaking engagements, panel discussions, symposia, and staff development programs. The Right to Read office has logged approximately three-to-five telephone inquiries each day from adults who wish help in reading. Other efforts in developing public interest in reading include newspaper, radio and

television coverage.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

A one-day conference was held at the Copley Plaza Hotel in the fall, to inform all Right to Read communities of a Right to Read/Massachusetts Teachers Association/Lesley College Collaborative formed to provide partially subsidized local staff development activities. Thirty-one communities were represented at the conference, of seventy-one invitations sent (44 per cent). Of these, six (19 per cent) indicated use of or plans to use the Collaborative. Conference questionnaires completed by forty-seven participants indicated understanding of the aims of the Collaborative, and of procedures required for its use (see Appendix C, page 44). 62 per cent indicated that the Collaborative was a good mechanism for providing in-service training, yet over twenty other mechanisms were cited as preferred. Among the reasons given for not using the Collaborative, cost, other available mechanisms, and lack of interest were prominent. Thus, reactions to the Collaborative were mixed. The Right to Read staff are exploring similar collaborative efforts, such as with the Massachusetts State College System.

In addition to large conferences, veteran Right to Read Directors worked on several diverse tasks on a regional basis, such as writing federal proposals and visiting developmental reading programs. In May, a conference was held at the Lenox Hotel to promote the organization of Right to Read Directors for mutual support on a regional basis. Of the fifty-two participants who completed a conference questionnaire, forty-four (85 per cent) were enthusiastic about such organization, and thirty-two (62 per cent) gave the prospect of such organization occurring a high probability (see Appendix D, page 51).

Of the many needs listed that could be met by such organization, sharing resources (52 per cent) and political "clout" (33 per cent) were prominent. Of the needs listed that could not be met by organizing, developing local teacher and administrator support (19 per cent) and community involvement (17 per cent) were most frequently mentioned.

The Right to Read staff visited twenty-nine schools in Massachusetts during the year. The nature of these visits varied, involving discussion of the local Right to Read program, needs assessment, and reading in the content areas, for example.

CERTIFICATION

The Right to Read staff has prepared information and recommendations regarding requirements for the certification of reading specialists. At this time, the direction that certification of reading specialists may take remains unclear.

IDENTIFICATION OF EXEMPLARY AND VALIDATED READING PROGRAMS

The Right to Read staff has worked with the Title IV C staff in developing Massachusetts criteria for identifying and validating exemplary reading programs for dissemination. The Right to Read staff remains skeptical, however, of exporting programs into different contexts.

III. STAGES OF INNOVATION: AN ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK FOR THE EVALUATION¹

The evaluation is placed within the framework of stages of innovation, treating the Massachusetts Right to Read Effort as an innovation -- a new and untested way of improving teaching and learning in the language arts. The central concept is that innovation is a complex process of development through distinct stages (or phases). Each stage is characterized by different concerns, different styles of action, and different levels of impact, as summarized in Figure 2 shown below.

FIGURE 2: Stages of Innovation

STAGE	CENTRAL CONCERN	STYLE OF ACTION	LEVEL OF IMPACT
1. Becoming	Acceptance	Reactive	Low
2. Developing	Effectiveness	Trial and Error	Moderate
3. Maturing	Efficiency	Directive	High
4. Transforming	Broader Application	Responsive	Moderate

As an innovation is initiated ("becoming " stage), typically in reaction to a problem or undesirable situation such as low reading scores, the innovation is concerned with being accepted by established groups and agencies. When acceptance, or at least non-rejection, seems reasonably assured, the innovation staff can focus its attention on finding ways to be effective in accomplishing its aims, typically by a trial and error method ("developing" stage). As the staff gains confidence in effective practices, and weeds out ineffective practices, it can direct the organization of the effective practices into an efficient overall operation ("maturing" stage). Given the added confidence of maturation, the staff can work for continued improvement or routinization of the innovation,

¹. This section is based on a paper written by the evaluator and two of his colleagues, under contract with the National Institute of Education.

or it can alter it in response to broader application or different contexts ("transforming" stage). Such alteration often reduces, temporarily, the impact.

The timing, ease, or trauma of passage between stages varies from innovation to innovation. In some cases, an innovation may regress to an earlier stage, and the boundaries between stages are often blurred together. The level of impact of the innovation varies by stage, as shown in Figure 2. Thus, innovation develops unevenly according to a unique pattern.

It would be unusual, however, for all aspects of an innovation to progress through the same stages at the same pace. An innovation such as the Right to Read Effort that combines several activities like training, committee work, and dissemination, for example, is typically a complex mix of stages. In this report, the various components of the Right to Read Effort are located at particular stages, based upon the evaluator's interpretation of the data collected.

This stage/component analysis is used here to facilitate understanding of where the Massachusetts Right to Read Effort is, how it got there, and where it should consider going for maximum impact. It is, however, merely one analytical framework -- one perspective among many possible perspectives. It derives from the evaluator's biases and assumptions about planned change and innovation, and should be judged by its practical utility to those responsible for guiding the Right to Read Effort.

IV. INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In section II under Findings, each component of the Massachusetts Right to Read Effort was described and assessed. It was shown that one-half of the Right to Read Directors become inactive after one or two years, despite the high ratings they give to their training. It was shown that reading and writing skills of Massachusetts secondary-school-level students remain below acceptable levels, yet at the same time Right to Read Directors report their efforts at secondary school reform to be the least successful. Efforts to stimulate citizen interest in reading continue through dissemination and committee work, yet lack of administrator and community support is the major reason cited for floundering local Right to Read programs. Local Right to Read Directors are beginning to organize to share resources and for political "clout", yet the various state and federal programs that address reading in the Commonwealth remain primarily isolated from each other. Collaborative in-service programs and other staff development mechanisms abound, yet the state lacks a certification program that could stimulate professional development. Thus, the Massachusetts Right to Read Effort is a complex of paradoxes.

In the evaluator's view, however, there is room for measured optimism. The Effort has not only survived for four years, but it has trained Right to Read Directors who have highly or moderately active reading improvement programs in half (thirty-six) of the seventy-two participating communities. 500 is not a bad batting average in any league. Given the small resources of Right to Read in proportion to its charge -- two professional staff and one secretary to "eliminate illiteracy in the Commonwealth" -- this and the other accomplishments are considerable.

The primary cause for optimism is, however, that most of the previously isolated components of the Right to Read Effort are ready to be put into a mutually reinforcing program in the coming year. In section III an analytic framework of stages of innovation was presented. Figure 3, shown here, displays the components of Right to Read in that framework as if a still photograph were taken of the effort at this writing, based on the evaluator's interpretation of the data collected.

FIGURE 3: Stages of the Components of the Massachusetts Right to Read Effort

<u>Becoming</u>	<u>Developing</u>	<u>Maturing</u>	<u>Transforming</u>
Certification	State Needs Assessment	Training of local Right to Read Directors	Technical Assistance
Identification of Exemplary Programs	Evaluation	Statewide Advisory Council	

State Education Agency Task Force		Criteria of Excellence	
		Dissemination	
-----	-----	-----	-----
Concern for Acceptance	Concern for Effectiveness	Concern for Efficiency	Concern for Broader Application
Reactive Style	Trial and Error Style	Directive Style	Responsive Style
Low Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Moderate Impact
-----	-----	-----	-----

Certification of reading specialists and identification and validation of exemplary programs are primarily efforts of other divisions of the Massachusetts

Department of Education, and are placed within dotted lines in Figure 3 to signify their remoteness to Right to Read. The evaluator recommends that the Right to Read staff continue to serve these efforts, but not to try to advance their stage development as they are essentially out of their control.

Movement of the State Education Agency Task Force is within their control, however, and increased efforts are recommended to bring this potentially important group into maturity during 1977-78. This should be possible by focusing the Task Force on interprogram (e.g., Title I, occupational education, special education) coordination regarding their language arts aspects. Given the dispersion and other commitments of the Task Force members, an intensified effort will probably require a new directive from the Massachusetts Commissioner of Education.

The state needs assessment is placed in the developing stage because of an experimental component planned for 1977-78. Retesting in reading and writing will be accompanied by an option for local school districts to use the state assessment instruments for a local assessment of reading and writing. This could provide an excellent opportunity for the Right to Read staff and local Directors to assist local districts in interpreting their results, and in planning improvements. In this role, Right to Read could extend its impact and visibility, and perhaps recruit new communities to participate in Right to Read, moving this component into maturity.

The Right to Read evaluation is also placed in the developing stage as it aims at increased usefulness, focuses on local school district impact, and is experimenting with a stage of innovation framework to facilitate understanding and future planning. It is recommended that future evaluations interview and

and observe teachers and students in a sample of participating local districts. Given the modest funds for evaluation, however, outside funds in the form of a research grant, for example, will be required for an in-depth assessment that would have high impact.

The training of local Right to Read Directors is placed at this point in time in the maturing stage as an efficient, highly rated routine that derives from four years of trial-and-error experience. The effectiveness of this training could be greatly extended, however, if a major effort is made during 1977-78 to complete and formalize the organization of Right to Read Directors on a regional basis. The regional organizations should focus on the factors cited for the 50 per cent attrition among veteran Right to Read Directors, such as the lack of administrator and community support, and the resistance to improve reading in the content areas in secondary schools. Members of the Statewide Advisory Council could work with these regional organizations in heightening citizen support in those regions by participating in the dissemination activities based on the criteria of excellence, and the responsibilities of teachers, parents and students.

The technical assistance component is placed in the transforming stage because it appears to be a moderately successful way of consulting with school districts in response to requests. The evaluator concurs with the Right to Read staff in extending this impact by having veteran Right to Read Directors perform this function also.

To bring each Right to Read component into the maturing stage, and to make all components more mutually reinforcing, the Right to Read staff will have to realign its allocation of time to direct and support the changes

recommended in this section. An example of mutual reinforcement would be reduced attrition of veteran Right to Read Directors through regional organization, targeted dissemination, and access to resources of other state and federal programs that involve reading. Such mutual reinforcement of the components would heighten the efficiency and impact of Right to Read, preparing it for broader application in Massachusetts, and as a model for other states through the National Right to Read Effort.

U = 1976-77 R2R Directors only.

TDR ASSOCIATES, INC.

375 Elliot Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02164

(617) 969-0651, 0652, 0653

APPENDIX A

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW (Draft, April 19, 1977)

24 Right to Read Directors: (8) 1974-75, (8) 1975-76, (8) 1976-77

INTRODUCTION: My name is _____. My company, TDR Associates of Newton, is working under contract to evaluate the Massachusetts Right to Read Effort. As part of the evaluation we are conducting telephone interviews with a random sample of veteran Right to Read Directors. Your name was drawn as part of the random sample, and the interview will take about 15 minutes. Is this a good time, or would it be better if we schedule another time?

CONDITIONS: You will have complete anonymity in this evaluation. Your name or town will not be identified in any written or verbal reports. We will summarize your comments with other comments in the total sample, and by year of training. Your honest evaluation will be appreciated.

1. Are you still an active R2R Director in _____?

 Yes
 No (explain)

2. What do you (expect) consider to be your major accomplishments as a R2R Director in _____?

3. What would you say were the major factors that contributed to these accomplishments?

4. What do you (expect) consider to be your major disappointments as a R2R Director in _____?

5. What would you say were the major factors that contributed to these disappointments?

6. What parts of your R2R training have helped you the most?

7. What parts of your R2R training have helped you the least?

8. What would you have needed from the R2R Effort in order to have made a greater impact?

9. What would you have needed from your school system for greater impact?

10. What advice would you give to the MA R2R staff in designing future R2R Programs?

1. QUESTION ONE: Who Are You and How Is Right to Read Going?

a. What is your position in the school system?

Director of Reading * **	10	(48%)
Remedial Reading Teacher *	6	(29%)
Elementary School Principal	2	(10%)
Reading Resource Teacher	1	(5%)
Director of Curriculum	1	(5%)
Fifth Grade Reading & Social Studies Teacher on Sabbatical	1	(5%)

b. Are you still Right to Read Director in your town?

Yes	18	(86%)
(one person is 1 of 5 Co-directors)		
No	3	(14%)
(two may be in 1977-78)		

c. How do you estimate your activity levels by year?

1976-77 Group; Training Year; 8 in Sample

<u>High Activity:</u> Needs Assessment completed, future plans defined, administrative support	2
--	---

<u>Moderate Activity:</u> Needs Assessment completed for most, but direction less clear; fairly good administrative support	3
---	---

<u>Low Activity:</u> Lack of enthusiasm/administrative support/special problems	3
---	---

1974-75 and 1975-76 Group; One & Two Years Past Training; 13 in Sample

<u>High Activity, All Years</u>	5
---------------------------------	---

* One person in this group is also Title I Director

** One person in this group is also Special Needs Coordinator

<u>High or Moderate Activity, First Two Years, then Loss of Direction / Support</u>	2	
<u>High or Moderate Activity, First Year, then Loss of Direction / Support</u>	6	
<u>Total Number Currently at Low Activity Level</u>	11	(52%)
<u>Total Number Currently at High Activity Level</u>	7	(33%)
<u>Total Number Currently at Moderate Activity Level</u>	3	(14%)

2. QUESTION TWO: What Do You Consider to Be Your Major Accomplishments
as a Right to Read Director?

(Many participants mentioned several)

Establishing Cooperative Relationships with Teachers, Forming Task Force, Developing Workshops, In-Service Training	10	(48%)
Working with Community, Training Volunteer Librarians and Tutors, Making Town See Need for Literacy	5	(23%)
Completion of Needs Assessment	4	(19%)
Developing General Plan of Action	3	(14%)
Working with Regional Right to Read Group	2	(10%)
None	5	(23%)

3. QUESTION THREE: What Would You Say Were the Major Factors that
Contributed to these Accomplishments?

Administrative Support	8	(38%)
Teacher Support	7	(33%)
Community Support (including School Committee)	4	(19%)
Other	4	(19%)
Own Ability to Work with People	2	(10%)
None	5	(23%)

4. QUESTION FOUR: What Do You Consider to Be Your Major Disappointments as a Right to Read Director?

&

5. QUESTION FIVE: What Were the Major Factors that Contributed to Them?

Reluctance of Teachers / Community / Administration Actively to Support Right to Read	7	(33%)
Lack of Funds to Carry Out Plans	5	(23%)
Lack of Time to Do Justice to Right to Read	4	(19%)
Inability to Deal Effectively with Adult Illiteracy	2	(10%)
Loss of Contact with Right to Read	2	(10%)
None	4	(19%)

6. QUESTION SIX: What Parts of Your Right to Read Training Helped You Most?

Technical Training: Change Agent Training, Learning to Do Needs Assessment, how to Organize Volunteers, and to Write Proposals	17	(81%)
Speakers at Workshops and Staff	10	(48%)
Becoming Acquainted with other Right to Read Directors	10	(48%)
Materials and Information	6	(29%)
Sessions after Training	3	(14%)
None	3	(14%)

7. QUESTION SEVEN: What Parts of Your Right to Read Training Helped You Least?

Particular Poor Speakers and Workshops	10	(48%)
Unsophisticated Level of some of the Instruction	6	(29%)
Poor Organization of Sessions	4	(19%)

Reports and Paper Work	3	(14%)
Long Distance to Travel	3	(14%)
Impractical Training: Too much Theory, Too Difficult	2	(10%)
Unclear Deadlines for Obtaining Funding	2	(10%)

a. General Attitude of Interviewees toward Training

Positive	10	(48%)
Strongly Positive	8	(38%)
Strongly Negative	2	(10%)
Negative	1	(5%)

8. QUESTION EIGHT: What Would You Have Needed from the Right to Read Effort in order to Have Made a Greater Impact?

More Money, Something Tangible to Show Teachers and Administration	7	(33%)
Nothing	6	(29%)
More Support, Guidance in Working with Own School System	5	(23%)
Better, More Practical Training	4	(19%)
More State-wide Publicity for Right to Read	2	(10%)

9. QUESTION NINE: What Would You Have Needed from Your School System for Greater Impact?

Nothing	9	(43%)
More Released Time, Reduced Work Load	7	(33%)
More Serious Commitment to Follow Through on Needs Assessment, Fewer Delays	6	(29%)
More Money	4	(19%)
More Staff	4	(19%)
More Teachers and Administrators Taking Right to Read Training	2	(10%)

10. QUESTION TEN: What Advice Would You Give to the Massachusetts
Right to Read Staff in Designing Future
Right to Read Programs?

Plan Programs more Carefully, Screen Speakers, Clarify Deadlines, Do not Underestimate Participants' Sophistication	8	(38%)
Pay more Attention to Problems of Individual School Departments, Give Needs Assessment to Participants Earlier and Follow up on It	7	(33%)
Other	7	(33%)
Supply more Concrete Evidence - Materials, Program, Money - for Participants to Share with Teachers, Administrators, and Community (Workshops, On-Site Visits from Right to Read mentioned)	6	(29%)
Facilitate Right to Read Directors Becoming Acquainted at Meetings, Include Fewer Outside Speakers, More Exchange	5	(23%)
Foster Exchange between Participating School Systems, Further Regular Regional Contact, Plan Visits	4	(19%)
Promulgate more State-wide and Local Public Relations	2	(10%)
None	3	(14%)



TDR ASSOCIATES, INC.

375 Elliot Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02164

(617) 969-0651, 0652, 0653

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION FORM: Right To Read, January 28, 1977
Workshop Training

I am: (check one) _____ Right to Read Director _____ Local Administrator
_____ Teacher Association Officer _____ Other (specify) _____

Of the following workshops, I have attended: (check one or more)

_____ December 15, 1976 _____ November 3, 1976
_____ November 29, 1976 _____ October 5, 1976

PART I -- DIRECTIONS: Circle one number on each five point scale shown below.
(R₂R = Right to Read)

a. How would you rate your capacity to write items for a needs assessment instrument?

1. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
2. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

b. How would you rate your capacity to teach your Task Force members, or others, to write items for a needs assessment instrument?

3. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
4. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

c. How confident do you feel about arranging for a valid administration of the needs assessment instrument?

5. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
6. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

d. How would you describe your understanding of the steps to be taken as a change agent?

7. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
8. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

e. What is the depth of your understanding of decoding as a point of view in teaching reading?

9. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
10. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

f. How well do you understand how to set up your local in-house Task Force, and to define its' tasks?

11. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
12. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

g. How would you rate your understanding of the difference between specific and global readiness?

13. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
14. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

h. How well do you understand the components of a successful in-service training program?

15. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
16. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

i. How well do you understand the benefits and responsibilities of being a participant in the Right to Read effort?

17. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
18. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

j. How would you rate your familiarity with current research on language acquisition and beginning reading instruction?

19. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
20. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

8 Questionnaires

Part I; a. 1. 2.5
 2. 4.0
 b. 3. 2.4
 4. 3.4 (7 replies)
 c. 5. 2.2
 6. 3.8
 d. 7. 2.6
 8. 3.6
 e. 9. 4.0
 10. 4.4
 f. 11. 2.4
 12. 3.4 (7 replies)
 g. 13. 2.1
 14. 2.9
 h. 15. 3.1
 16. 3.4
 i. 17. 1.9
 18. 3.9
 j. 19. 2.9
 20. 3.4

Part II

a. Topics requiring further information/explanation

.25 Specific vs. Global Readiness
 In-Service Training
 Force Field Analysis
 .13 More on Readiness
 RIF
 Decoding
 Current Research, Sec. Level Reading
 Establishing In-house Task Force & Local Advisory Committee
 Requirements re Written Reports (forms, due dates)

.13 did not reply to IIa.

Equivalents

.13 1
 .25 2

Right to Read Eval. Form 1/28/77

II b. How to improve Format, clarify Material

- .25 Fine Job
 - .13 "helpful to hear from former participants"
- .13 Advanced Agendas
 - Outline of Topics/ 2-yr. R₂R Commitment
 - More Stress on Given Topics, rather than Overview leaving unanswered questions
 - L.E.A. Reps meet and share Pros & Cons for portion of each session after the 3rd
 - A.V. material, if available, might be "motivating" for 1 or 2 sessions (Video-Tape perhaps)
 - Eliminate the particular Change Agent Speaker

.13 did not reply to IIb.

IIc. Advice/Recommendations

- .13 "Keep up Good Work!"
 - "Planners' Expertise is admirable"
 - Joe Tremont more often
 - Fewer on Agenda per session, more in-depth per topic
 - Keep L.E.A.'s in-formed
 - Avoid "Show and Tell", Provide more "How To's"
 - Schedule Meetings at least 4 months in advance

.25 No remarks for IIc.

This includes .13 of part a and b, who commented he attended only 1 session, felt remarks might not be "valid", stated it is "apparently an excellent experience"



TDR ASSOCIATES, INC.

375 Elliot Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02164

(617) 969-0651, 0652, 0653

EVALUATION FORM: Right To Read, April 27, 1977
Workshop Training

I am: (check one) _____ Right to Read Director _____ Local Administrator
_____ Teacher Association Officer _____ Other (specify) _____

PART I -- Directions: Circle one number on each five point scale shown below.
(R₂R = Right to Read)

a. How would you rate your capacity to conduct a reading needs assessment for your school system?

1. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
2. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

b. How well can you identify and describe the parts required for a comprehensive plan of action?

1. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
2. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

c. To what extent do you understand several different ways of conducting staff development?

1. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
2. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

d. How would you rate your capacity to gain the cooperation of groups in R₂R activities?

1. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
2. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

e. How well do you understand how to set up a local advisory council?

1. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
2. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

f. How well do you understand how to find and train volunteers to be tutors?

a. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
b. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

PART II -- DIRECTIONS: Please write brief answers to the three questions shown below:

- a. Do you need further information on or explanation of any topics covered in the sessions thus far? If so, which ones?
- b. How could the format of the training sessions to date be improved to make the material clearer to you? Please be specific.
- c. What general advice or recommendations would you give the planners of these sessions?

Right to Read Evaluation Form

April 27

Workshop Training

13 Questionnaires

Part I;	a.	1.	1.85
		2.	4.46
	b.	1.	2.23
		2.	3.80
	c.	1.	2.88
		2.	3.50
	d.	1.	2.10
		2.	3.38
	e.	1.	1.80
		2.	3.88
	f.	1.	2.62
		2.	3.73

Right to Read 4/27/77

13 Questionnaires

Equivalents

.08	1
.15	2
.23	3
.31	4
.38	5
.46	6

Part II, a. Further Information/explanation

.23	No, well done	3
.15	No reply	2
.15	Staff Development Recruit/Train Volunteers (Tutors) Plan of Action Funding	2
	.08 Being covered today Writing Proposals/Fed. Grants	
.08	Force Field Analysis Beg. Reading Skills - decoding/encoding, relation to Comprehension R2R Directors' Work following training & assessment, years 1,2,& 3 Writing Items for NAI	1

Part II, b. Improvement of Format, Clarification of Material

.31	No reply	4
.46	Sessions need better organization, some restructuring	6
	.15 Condensation Shorter Lunch Break (90 min.s!)	
	.08 Begin on Time More Work in Smaller Groups Introduce Participants More Interaction with Speakers More Interaction with Members Morning Sessions livelier than Afternoon	
.38	Content needs some Changes	5
	.15 More Work-Shop type Presentations	
	.08 "Hands-on", afternoons	
	Hand-outs are useful	
	.08 Proposal-writing needed one covering main points Perhaps follow-up of some hand-outs	
	.08 Audio-Visual approaches, afternoons Better Speakers	

Right to Read Eval. Form 4/27/77

Part II, c. Advice/Recommendations

.15 No reply

.38 Timing/Scheduling

.31 Shorter Time Periods

.15 Shorten Afternoons

.08 Shorter Lectures
 $\frac{1}{2}$ Days

.08 Start earlier/on time

Three Days in Succession

.23 Advance Planning

.08 Agendas sent earlier
List of Speakers/Topics for the year
Coordinate R₂R Meetings' Topics with Particular
Schools' Problems

.31 Reassess Content

.08 End-of-year: Dynamic Speaker and/or L.E.A. Veteran Dir.s
More Joe Tremont
Further Development of issues raised at early sessions
P.R. - writing releases, samples
Use Lunchtime for Feedback-input , individual L.E.A. programs
Compile List of 10 best books re Reading, make gift of 10
to each teacher: participants in reading
program should be reading

.08 Audio-visual Equipment available to Guest Speakers



TDR ASSOCIATES, INC.

375 Elliot Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02164

(617) 969-0651, 0652, 0653

EVALUATION FORM: Right to Read, June 16, 1977
Workshop Training

Part I -- Directions: Circle one number on each five point scale shown below.
(R₂R = Right to Read)

a. How would you rate your capacity to write a federal proposal?

1. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
2. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

b. How would you rate your understanding of new developments in reading comprehension research?

1. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
2. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

c. To what extent do you understand the concept of continuous progress in reading?

1. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
2. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

d. To what extent do you understand several different ways of evaluating a reading program?

1. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
2. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

e. How well do you understand how to develop administrative support for Right to Read in a school system?

1. Before R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	poor	adequate	good	excellent
2. Because of R ₂ R:	1	2	3	4	5

f. What did you gain from your visit to Watertown?
(Please explain.)

Right to Read, June 16

Workshop Training

Part I

a. 1.) 2.0

2.) 2.63 (7 replies)

b. 1.) 3.0

2.) 4.25

c. 1.) 2.63

2.) 3.88 (7 replies)

d. 1.) 2.81

2.) 4.25

e. 1.) 3.13

2.) 4.75

f. Visit to Watertown

.50	Unable to attend	4
.13	Received good "feedback"	1
"	Substitute not impressed	"
.25	Our Reading Program is "good", compares well	2
.13	How to organize Reading Lab; our system needs a secondary level reading specialist	1
"	Not overly impressed with Watertown, but it is a good example of "public relations"; E.D.I. material is good; trip was necessary	1

g. Attendance at Sessions

.38	All	3
.13	No Reply	1
"	All from Nov. 3 on	
"	a & b	
"	a, b, & c	
"	(Sub. attended d & f)	
"	d & e	

375 Elliot Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02164

(617) 969-0651, 0652, 0653

APPENDIX C

EVALUATION FORM: Copley Plaza Conference, November 19, 1976
Staff Development for Reading Improvement

Please write brief answers to the following questions in the spaces provided. Use the back of this sheet if you need more space, identifying the question number.

I am: (check one) ☐ Right To Read Director ☐ Local Administrator
☐ Teacher Association Officer ☐ Other (specify) _____

1. Please describe the procedures you need to follow to use the services of the Massachusetts Teachers Association/ Lesley College Collaborative.
2. Do you feel that the MTA/Lesley Collaborative is a good mechanism for your use in providing in-service training in your school system ? If not, please describe other mechanisms that you would prefer.
3. Identify two ways of doing staff development that you learned today beyond the usual, such as lecturing.
4. Describe the most important thing you've learned today about reading in the content areas in secondary schools.

COPLEY CONFERENCE

11/19/76

47 Questionnaires

#1			
.15	No Reply		7
	.02	Program already instituted Union city, not applicable	
.40	Contact Superintendent/Administration		19
	.23	Specified Superintendent	11
	.04	Immediate Supervisors	2
.30	Contact Local Teachers Ass'n		14
	.02	Compare benefits now received from course remuneration	1
	"	Organize Cooperative Right to Read	
.25	Design/Outline Course		12
	.09	Consult Teachers	4
	.02	Consult Superintendent Right to Read Task Force Letter to Judy Inc. outline of Expenses	
.21	Contact MTA/Lesley		10
	.04	To present needs	
	.02	To org. demonstrated needs into credit course If teacher is needed To present outline To work out Contract	1
.19	Contact School Committee		9
	.04	via Superintendent	
.17	Assess Needs		8
"	Contact Teachers		
	.09	For Program Planning	4
	.02	Who might teach courses	

COPLEY

#1 (cont!.)

.13	Assemble Group of 15	6
.02	"get names of prospects", 15 not specified Could begin by using next year's 4 ½-day workshops	
.09	Find Instructors	4
.04	Contact MTA	2
.02	Present plan Meet with officers, establish procedural guidelines	
.02	Funding	1
	Breakdown: \$150 each; own teacher, gov't. refund; ask for teacher, no ref.; MTA refund \$30 for member participants	
	Information <u>re</u> available resources, consultants	
	Convince local Union President	
	Union city, tie-in not feasible	
	Return to Committee for further evaluation	
	"Sell the Program"	
	Contact Joe if you have teacher to propose	
	Present Plan to State Right to Read	
	All agencies & individuals unite, present cooperative service	

COPLEY

#2

.09	No Reply	4
	.02 Union city - not applicable	
.62	Yes	29
	.06 Foreseeable future	
	.04 High Cost =concern	
	" One possibility	
	.02 Might try Needs Assessment, on-hand teacher/person with use of consultants Long overdue approach to teacher involvement/improvement Hope School Committee will listen	
.12	Possibility	5
	.04 For Graduate Work	
	.02 Glad to see lower fee	
	.02 Interested in pursuing idea Teachers have to be educated to pay for in-service 1-credit course more successful than longer one \$25 fee interesting, LEA in-service accredited by Lesley	
.12	Reservations/Uncertainty	5
	.02 Political aspect = difficulty	
	. Size restrictions = " "	
	How to generate teacher interest?	
	Competition with own in-service program financed by Sch. Comm.	
	Lesley already offers courses, town absorbs some costs	
.02	No	
Other mechanisms		
.02	Films, texts (such as Lexington Spec. Ed.) by R ₂ R with grant Use an existing Lesley course Develop our own course Plan not so directly tied to MTA or given college Depends on the school system and the political process	

#3

.34	No Reply	16
.02	Knew most of them Lectures' suggestions only	1
.21	Listed 1 way	10
.32	Workshops	15
.12	Specified "Hands-on"	5
.02	Differentiated btw. "idea" and "materials"	1
.19	Tapes	9
.17	Demonstrations	8
.06	Specified teacher involvement	3
.09	Contact, Interaction with Classroom Teachers	4
.02	Specified <u>in</u> classroom	1
.09	In-Service	4
.04	Specified ^{by} teachers in system	2
.02	" by 'practical consultants'	1
.04	Inside Consultants	2
.02	Specified course credit and funding for these	1
	Marathon Week-end	2
	John Savage a good motivator	"
.02	Outside Consultant	1
	Prepared Program	1
.04	Discussions	2
.02	Specified "Team ": R2R Dir., Admin., Pres., T. Ass'n.	1
.02	Independent, individual study	1
	MTA/Lesley course type	

COPLEY

#4

.06	No Reply	
.36	Onus on Teachers	17
.15	They must be made aware, face responsibilities, recognize interrelationships	7
.09	New ideas, various "strategies", practical suggestions <u>re</u> working with teachers so they will incorporate reading skills	4
.02	Teachers <u>are</u> "carrying all the freight" Did not "learn" this today, stress interaction	1 "
.13	Vocabulary	6
.12	Mrs. Berkowitz	5
.06	Teacher/Student Involvement .02 (implied)	3
	"'Reading' is reading something"	
	Totally cooperative effort	
	Continual problem	
	Secondary Level programs are possible	
.04	Students must "see relationships"	2
	No single answer	
.02	Dr. Savage	1
	Community involvement	1
	Limit service, focus on 2 areas	
	Practical units	
	Salary or Credits = "the name of the game"	
	Problem is "middle kid" in overcrowded class, 766 complicates	
	Second year program possibilities	
	Relevancy	
	Difficult	
	Essential	
	Requires enthusiasm, hard work, caring	
	Another approach to difficult task	
	Can be fascinating, fun	
	Games for students, teachers	
	Intra-mural Spelling Bees	
	Shew "how" instead of lecture	
	Lecture from Outline & include discussion, distribute speech after lecture	
	Handouts were thoughtful	
	Director of Elementary Education	



TDR ASSOCIATES, INC.

375 Elliot Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02164

(617) 969-0651, 0652, 0653

APPENDIX D

EVALUATION FORM: Right to Read, May 20, 1977

Lenox Hotel Conference

The purpose of this form is to enable you to express your opinions about the idea of organizing Right to Read Directors in Massachusetts. Please answer all questions and give your form to Jenifer Skeele before going to lunch.

1. How enthusiastic or unenthusiastic are you about the ideas of organizing Right to Read directors on a regional basis?

UNENTHUSIASTIC

NEUTRAL

ENTHUSIASTIC

(circle one) 1

2

3

2. How realistic is the prospect of Right to Read directors becoming organized in your region?

LOW PROBABILITY

MODERATE PROBABILITY

HIGH PROBABILITY

1

2

3

3. Describe two important needs of Right to Read directors in your region that could be best met by organizing:

4. Describe two important needs of Right to Read directors in your region that could probably not be met by organizing:

5. Please make other comments about today's conference not covered by the questions on this form:

LENNOX HOTEL CONFERENCE

52 Questionnaires

1 did not answer #s 3, 4, & 5	.02
12 did not answer #s 4 & 5	.23
13 did not answer #4	.25
9 did not answer # 5	.17

Question 1 2.81

44 = Enthusiastic	3=Neutral	2 = Neutral + (2.5)	3 = Unenthusiastic
-------------------	-----------	------------------------	--------------------

Question 2 2.63

32 = High Probability	19 = Mod. Prob.	1=Mod. Prob. + (2.5)	0 = Low Probability
-----------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	---------------------

Question 3: Two Needs organizing could meet

.52 Need to Share Resources - human and material
(27 replies)

Of these, .096 (5) defined it as need for communication

.15 (8) made distinctions, thereby listing 2 needs
e.g. Ideas/Materials

.06 (3, not inc. in the 27) specifically suggested a
Resource Center

.33 Need for Political action, pressure, "clout", voice
(17 replies)

Of these, .17 (9) referred specifically to State legislation /reading

.096 would establish Reading as Priority for political
attention

.08 State Level

.02 generally

.23 Sharing Resources and Political Involvement are the 2 Important Needs
(12 replies)

.058 replies listed only 1 need (3)

Lennox

Question 3 (cont.)

.29
(15 replies)

Staff Development/In-Service Training

Of these, .04 specified Share In-Service Costs
.02 " Self-Help In-Service
" " In-Service for Dept. Chairmen

.12
(6 replies)

Funding

Of these, .04 Proposals for Grants could be prepared
.02 Fed. & State funds could be obtained
" State Grants " "
" School Committee funds " "
" unqualified

.06
(3 replies)

Reading as a Priority (no political connotation)

Regional Support

Of these, .02 Share Learning Kits regionally

.04
(2 replies)

Improve Teaching/Training of Reading Teachers

.02 Expressed as "Make Personnel changes"

.02
(Single replies)

Publicity/Importance of R₂R

Support System

Organize with others (Mass. Reading Ass'n, Title I, etc.)

Parent Support

Introduction & Support of Reading/Sec. Level

Membership Directory

Local People to teach local people Reading Process

Pressure for Reading Curriculum Dir., State Level

Reading Training for Certification

Stress Reading for Content

Needs Assessment

Consolidate "Educational Needs in Reading"

Meeting to consider actual organizing

Organizing "not possible until probably common goals are met"

Lennox

Question 4: Two Needs organizing probably could not meet

.5 replied to the question (26 replies)

.20 listed 1 Need (10 ")

.19 Local Teaching Staff/Administration Support
(10 replies) .04 made distinctions, thereby listing 2 needs

.04 Local Staff

.02 Administration

" Finding a Superintendent

" More local Reading personnel

" Evaluation of Materials re Reading

" Local In-Service Training

" Immediate Staff changes

" Status of Reading & of R₂R Director

" Directors' Initiative & Teachers' Enthusiasm

" Solid Commitment of All Teachers to R₂R

" Scope & Sequence of Reading/given school

.17 Community Involvement
(9 replies)

.06 Parent Support

.06 Local School Cooperation and Community Concern are the 2 Important Needs
(3 replies)

(.13 Funding
(7 replies)

.096 Only need listed

.02 Noted funds could indirectly be obtained by helping L.E.A.
prepare grants (meaning proposals for)

.04 Time
(2 replies)
Clout

.02
(Single replies)

Moral Support

MAL

Local Schools' Issues with School Committees

Need to know regional people before organizing

What would not organizing accomplish?

Work hard enough, can accomplish anything!

Lennox

Question 5: Comments not covered by questions

.58 replied to the question

(30 replies)

.35 Expressed Praise/Enthusiasm; described meeting as well organized, relevant
(18 replies)

- .04 Good Location
- Questioned Political Orientation (1 the need; 1 the wisdom)
- .02 Good Facilities
- Much needed Leadership emerging
- Leadership = "Grass Roots"
- Excellent session with Faith
- Praise for Jean Slingerland
- Hope R2R will progress

.02

(Single replies)

Publicity, Press Conference for Lennox
Lennox Follow-up: Meeting for each Region
Meeting of Worcester Directors
September Follow-up
Send Review Letters before end of school
Meeting held too late in year
Lack of Attendance = disheartening
Discussion Group time too short
R2R should Team with IRA, MRA, NERA, Title I, etc.
READERS' model program should be State Level
State Dir. of Reading = good idea
Enlist local Superintendent, School Committee
Involve local Teachers' Ass'n., make Reading part of bargaining, included
in contract agreement
S.E. too solemn, left too many questions unanswered
Joe should highlight Conference topics in remaining training sessions of
1st year R2R directors

1 of the 18 enthusiasts made following points:

Kit idea is good
Business & Science Model too costly (money, time, energy)
Teachers must be ~~tired~~
too much fragmentation, lack of continuity
Set Minimum Standards at various levels, State Testing
Reaffirm Priority of Printed Matter over T.V. & other media

ACME
BOOKBINDING CO., INC.

SEP 6 1990

100 CAMBRIDGE STREET
CHARLESTOWN, MASS.

